

AMENDMENT TO THE DRAWINGS

Replacement to FIGS. 1, 2, 4, 5, 7, 14A and 15 are attached to this amendment.

<remainder of page intentionally left blank>

REMARKS

Claims 1-34, and 37-45 are pending in this application. Claims 1-7, 9, 33, 37, and 40 are amended. Claims 11-32, 38 and 39 are withdrawn. Claims 35 and 36 are canceled. Reconsideration and allowance of the claims are requested in view of the following remarks.

DRAWINGS

Replacement drawings are filed for FIGS. 1, 2, 4, 5, 7, 14A, and 15 to correct obvious typographical errors in the figures. In FIG. 1 reference numeral 291d is replaced with 291e. In FIG. 2 reference numerals 219 and 219a-e are replaced with 291 and 291a-e. In FIG. 4 reference numeral 291d is replaced with 291e. In FIG. 5 reference numerals 219 and 219a-e are replaced with 291 and 291a-e. In FIG. 7 a line is drawn from reference numeral 391a to the element depicted by reference numeral 391a. In FIG. 14a reference numeral 361a is replaced with 361. In FIG. 15 reference numeral 317d is replaced with 317e.

REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. §102(b)

Claims 1-10, 33-37 and 40-42 are rejected under §102(b) as being anticipated by Kobayashi et al. (USP 6,384,593). Applicants traverse this rejection.

The Examiner alleges that claim 1 is anticipated by Kobayashi et al. However, the Examiner provides no specific reference or evidence that Kobayashi et al. discloses that a soak chamber, a test chamber, and a desoak chamber can be separated from a main body.

MPEP 2173.05(g) specifically provides that “functional limitations must be evaluated and considered, just like any other limitation of the claim.” The Examiner alleges that

Kobayashi et al. discloses that a soak chamber, a test chamber, and a desoak chamber can separated from a main body, yet provides no reference as to where in Kobayashi et al. such teaching or suggestion thereof is disclosed. To be anticipated under §102, the prior art reference must teach or suggest all the limitations of the claim, or the Examiner must provide extrinsic evidence that the prior art reference is enabled. MPEP 2131.01(I).

The characterization of Kobayashi et al. lies in the arrangement of a loader section and an unloader section located in front of a test chamber. Column 11, lines 8-23. Applicants submit that Kobayashi et al. does not teach or suggest that a soak chamber, a test chamber, and a desoak chamber are adapted to be separated from a main body.

In addition, claim 1 has been amended to recite, *inter alia*, that the main body includes a loading robot, a sorting robot, and an unloading robot, and the unloading robot adapted to move alone the X and Y axes. The Examiner alleges that Kobayashi et al. teaches unloading robot (movable arm 402) on page 5 of the Office Action. Column 4, lines 30-33, of Kobayashi et al. specifically teaches that the movable arm 402 only moves in the Y direction. Accordingly, Kobayashi et al. also fails to teach “unloading robot ... adapted to move along an X-axis and a Y-axis,” as recited in claim 1.

Claim 1 is patentable over the Kobayashi et al. for at least the reasons given above. Claim 2 is also patentable for depending on a patentable base claim.

The Examiner alleges that Kobayashi et al. also teaches all the features of claim 3. Claim 3 recites, *inter alia*, that the user trays are adapted to be interchangeable such that the user trays may be used to stack devices prior to a test and to stack the devices after the test. Again, the

Examiner fails to provide evidence where in Kobayashi et al. the above underlined limitation is taught.

In addition, claim 3 has also been amended to recite, *inter alia*, that the main body includes a loading robot, a sorting robot, and an unloading robot, and the unloading robot adapted to move alone X and Y axes. The Examiner alleges that Kobayashi et al. teaches unloading robot (movable arm 402) on page 5 of the Office Action. Column 4, lines 30-33, of Kobayashi et al. specifically teaches that the movable arm 402 only moves in the Y direction.

Applicants submit that Kobayashi et al. fails to teach that the user trays are adapted to be interchangeable such that user trays may be used to stack devices prior to a test and to stack the devices after the test, and “unloading robot ... adapted to move along an X-axis and a Y-axis,” as recited in claim 3. Accordingly, claim 3 is patentable over Kobayashi et al. for at the reasons given above. Claim 4, dependent on an allowable base, is also patentable for the same reasons given with respect to the patentability of claim 3.

Claim 5 recites, *inter alia*, that “user tray functions being adapted to be interchangeable during stacker operation.” Again, the Examiner fails to provide evidence where in Kobayashi et al. the above underlined limitation is taught.

In addition, claim 5 has also been amended to recite, *inter alia*, that the main body includes a loading robot, a sorting robot, and an unloading robot, and the unloading robot adapted to move alone X and Y axes. The Examiner alleges that Kobayashi et al. teaches unloading robot (movable arm 402) on page 5 of the Office Action. Column 4, lines 30-33, of Kobayashi et al. specifically teaches that the movable arm 402 only moves in the Y direction.

Applicants submit that Kobayashi et al. fails to teach that user tray functions being adapted to be interchangeable during stacker operation, and “unloading robot ... adapted to move along an X-axis and a Y-axis”, as recited in claim 5. Accordingly, claim 5 is patentable over Kobayashi et al. for at least the reasons given above.

With regard to claim 6, the claim recites, *inter alia*, that the user tray feeder and the user tray sender are adapted to be interchanged in their uses in accordance with the process of the test. The Examiner fails to provide evidence where in Kobayashi et al. the above underlined function is taught.

In addition, claim 6 has also been amended to recite, *inter alia*, that the main body includes a loading robot, a sorting robot, and an unloading robot, and the unloading robot adapted to move alone X and Y axes. The Examiner alleges that Kobayashi et al. teaches unloading robot (movable arm 402) on page 5 of the Office Action. Column 4, lines 30-33, of Kobayashi et al. specifically teaches that the movable arm 402 only moves in the Y direction.

Applicants submit that Kobayashi et al. fails to teach that user tray functions being adapted to be interchangeable during stacker operation, and “unloading robot ... adapted to move along an X-axis and a Y-axis”, as recited in claim 6. Accordingly, claim 6 is patentable over Kobayashi et al. for at least the reasons given above. Dependent claim 8-10 are also patentable for depending on allowable base claim 6.

Claim 33 is rejected as being anticipated by Kobayashi et al. Claim 33 recites, *inter alia*, “operating speeds of a loading robot, a sorting robot, and an unloading robot is determined based on a speed of testing a device.” The Examiner fails to provide evidence where in Kobayashi et al. the above underlined function is taught.

Applicants submit that Kobayashi et al. fails to teach that user tray functions being adapted to be interchangeable during stacker operation, and “the unloading robot adapted to move along an X-axis and a Y-axis,” as recited in claim 33.

Accordingly, claim 33 is patentable over Kobayashi et al. for at least the reason given above. Dependent claim 8-10 are also patentable for depending on allowable base claim 33.

Claims 35 and 36 are canceled, thereby, rendering moot the Examiner’s rejection thereof.

The Examiner alleges that Kobayashi et al. teaches all the features of claim 37. Claim 37 is a method claim, which recites, *inter alia*, “stacking at least one tested device on the at least one user tray feeder.” The Examiner fails to provide evidence where in Kobayashi et al. the above underlined limitation is taught.

The Examiner only provides evidence to reference numeral 304, which the Examiner alleges is the tray feeder. Even assuming that reference 304 is the tray feeder, the Examiner fails to disclose where in Kobayashi et al. the above underlined limitation is taught. In fact, Applicants submit there is no such teaching or suggestion in Kobayashi et al. Accordingly, claim 37 is patentable over Kobayashi et al. for at least the reason given above.

The Examiner alleges that Kobayashi et al. teaches all the features of claim 40. Claim 40 is a method claim, which recites, *inter alia*, “sending control signals to at least one robot to carry a device for a test detecting a time for the test.” The Examiner fails to provide evidence where in Kobayashi et al. the above underlined limitation is taught.

The Examiner only provides evidence towards reference numeral 304, which the Examiner alleges is the robot, yet the Examiner has also alleged that reference numeral 304 as being a tray feeder with regard to rejecting claim 37. Regardless, the Examiner fails to disclose

where in Kobayashi et al. the above underlined limitation is taught. In fact, Applicants submit there is no such teaching or suggestion in Kobayashi et al. Accordingly, claim 40 is patentable over Kobayashi et al. for at least the reason given above. Claims 41 and 42 are also patentable for depending on a patentable base claim.

CONCLUSION

In view of the above remarks and amendments, the Applicants respectfully submit that each of the rejections has been addressed and overcome, placing the present application in condition for allowance. A notice to that effect is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned.


Should there be any outstanding matters that need to be resolved in the present application, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact John A. Castellano at the telephone number of the undersigned below.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 08-0750 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. § 1.16 or under 37 C.F.R. § 1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.

Respectfully submitted,

HARNESS, DICKY, & PIERCE, P.L.C.

By



John A. Castellano, Reg. No. 35,094
P.O. Box 8910
Reston, Virginia 20195
(703) 668-8000

JAC/LYP/cm